F. 71 & 72 70.000 (1 1 3

19 34

Department of L. A. Sect

OFFICE Sandgate

STATION

No 636

Dated 24-2-34

Given for copying

Copied

Examined

Signed

Given for despatch

Despatched

Indexed

To be destroyed on

nt Treatment —

with wood - Pavement

Forwarded — y. L.

Communicat

dities in in the case of permanent records.

Revenue Department

SECY.
12 OCT 1933

Settlement - Resettlement - (South Kanara) - Coconut plantations on dry lands - Classification as garden.

Letter from the Director of Agriculture, D.3 No.1483/33 dated September 1933.

Enclosure the petition of M.R.Ry. K.L. Bhandary Avargal B.A., together with the report of the Deputy Director of Agriculture thereon R.O.C. No. 791/33 dated the 13th September 1933, giving in detail the hardships that would be caused to the ryots by the re-classification of dry land where coconuts are grown into garden land, for levy of garden assessment. The report of the Deputy Director states the position fully. The need is to distinguish between the cultivation of coconuts with rain or restricted irrigation and with full irrigation. The former is resorted to practically entirely only in the West Coast. The growing of coconuts on dry land on the West Coast has been one of the main items of improvement introduced by the Agricultural Department and a considerable area of Government waste land has been so used. The classification of such land as garden land under the same conditions as irrigated land will probably stop the extension of coconuts on dry land and will not only lead to a smaller growth of Government revenue than otherwise, but also give a set back to the extended cultivation of coconuts in this country which is needed to meet the internal demand for coconuts for industrial uses without imports from outside.

2. I therefore recommend that the criterion proposed by the Deputy Director of Agriculture, namely that trees should be 25 years old before they are treated as bearing in the case of coconut cultivation on dry land on the West Coast, may be accepted for settlement classification.

ENDORSEMENT No. 3467 E./33-1 dated 10th October 1933.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for early remarks.

J.A.Thorne,
Secretary to Government.

To

The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue & Settlement
with Encl. in original to be returned.

Forwarded.

(By order)

Superintendent.

A.K.

12 3

Settlement - Resettlement -
(S. Kanara) - Coconut plantations
on dry lands - Classification a
garden.

AS (SPK)

pp 1-13 ?

3573 with 3 encls. - A

Ref ✓ 3577/33-1 & 23 to 27

forwarded to the
S.S.O. Nos. IV Party for early
remarks, after inspecting, ~~if~~
~~necessary~~, the Nileshwar Agricultural
Research Station and discussing the
matter with the Dy. Dir. of Agriculture
VII circle

14.10.33

K.G.
14.X.33

16.10.33

Confidential.
C.F. 32.

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.*

Settlement Party. ~~DEPARTMENT.~~

SECY. 25 NOV 1933

Received 17 *Registered* 3513

From (Name) E. W. Bouchier Esquire, I. C. S.,
(Designation) Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV,
POST BOX ....., (STATION) Mangalore.
Telegraphic Address .....

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, M a d r a s.
through the Collector of South Kanara.

Sir, Ref.A2 No. 3524/33-1 dated 21st November 33.

ENCLOSURES .....
.....
.....

SPARE COPIES.....

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district - Coconut plantations on dry lands - Classification as Garden Report - S u b m i t t e d.

Ref: Board's reference F.3513/33-1, dated 23/10/33

I have inspected the Nileshwar No.2 and 3 experimental stations and have discussed the matter with the Deputy Director of Agriculture, Tellicherry. A good deal of information on the subject is contained in Leaflet No.4 of the Department of Agriculture. The Leaflet bears no date but was, apparently, published in 1928. I did not inspect the Pilicode (sometimes referred to as Nileshwar No.I) station. I understand it is inferior to the Nileshwar No.2, which is considered to be the best of the new "dry" plantations. At Kasaragod, the Department took over plantations which had already been developed. The results of that station demonstrate the benefits of "intercultivation" and regular manuring, unaccompanied by artificial irrigation in a mature garden. They do not prove that it is possible in South Kanara, to raise a profitable plantation by the use of the "dry" method from the beginning.

There is nothing new in the "dry" cultivation method. It has been practised in Malabar, and with success, for

generations. A fair proportion of the Malabar gardens, those situated on the banks of rivers or backwaters or on the fringes of low-lying double-crop wet-lands do not in any case, require artificial irrigation. As regards the rest, artificial irrigation is common only in the flat coastal area where the sandy soil has no capacity for retaining moisture and quickly becomes parched in the dry season. The dry cultivation of coconuts on the terraced slopes of low hills is especially common in Kurumbran taluk. The majority of these gardens have never ~~trees~~ irrigated at any stage; and their quality is generally good. The method of cultivation is very much the same as that advocated in leaflet No.44, except that the ryot is usually content with a single ploughing at the beginning of the South West Monsoon. I dislike generalising about South Kanara, as my experience is confined to a part only of the district. I think it is true to say that this method was not commonly followed in South Kanara. ~~The South Kanara ryot~~ grew his coconuts in situations where they had a fairly constant supply of water all the year round or irrigated them artificially. The difference between the two districts is certainly surprising. I have put to several people including officers of the Agricultural Department, the question, --considering that the ryots or Malabar, especially of Kurumbranad taluk, have always cultivated coconuts without irrigation,-- why has the method not been followed in South Kanara? I have not received any satisfactory answer and it is not easy to believe, as assumed in paragraph 18 (second part) of the Leaflet No.44 that it is due entirely to the ignorance or indifference of the South Kanara ryot. The success of the method in Kurumbranad may be due to some special quality of soil, climate or situation. I cannot say The old view in South Kanara was, evidently, that the only kinds of land in the District really suitable for coconut cultivation are the banks of rivers and backwater and the sandy coastal area (where gardens are usually irrigated by artificial means). I think it is too early for us to assert with confidence that this view was incorrect.

The trees ~~in block II~~ of the Nileshwar No.2 station appea to be healthy enough, though immature for their age. A close inspection reveals that the yield is disappointing and the figure which are kept for each tree, prove this beyond doubt. The statement given by the Deputy Director shows the yield up to 1931 The 1932 yield was much inferior to that of 1931. I append a statement which shows, in general, a considerable falling off fro the figures of 1931. 1932 was not a good year for coconuts, but it ought not to have affected to such an extent the yield of a growing plantation. And I understand that this year's yield is even poorer than that of 1932, inspite of abundant rainfall. The only explanation I can offer is this: The really novel featu of the Nileshwar plantation was that the method of surface planti was adopted. This method is discussed in paragraph 9 of the leaflet. The Agricultural Department have now, apparently, decided that this method which was based on a belief that the coconut tree is a surface feeder was a mistake. I understand that the existing trees in No.2. station are to be removed and replaced by new seedlings, which will not be planted on the surface. Blocks V and VI have been almost entirely cleared and felling is still going on. Some of the trees have been replante in another piece of land owned by the Department. Others have been sold. Unfortunately the method of surface planting produce up to the time of flowering, a quick, fair growth which appeared to demonstrate the success of the method. Its inherent defect is that it restricts the growth of the root system with the result that the tree has not the vigour to produce the number of nuts it ought to.

It will be observed that the yield of block II is much inferior to that of block I, although the two plantations are of the same sort of soil, were started at the same time, and have received the same treatment. I am told th

be explained but may be due to the ract that the drainage is bad in parts of ~~this~~ block. II. This supports the inference that natural conditions count enormously in the growth of coconuts, and that before applying new methods of cultivation it should first be ascertained what natural conditions are suitable

The accounts of the cultivation expenses are straightforward ug... Annual cultivation now costs the Department between 7-8 annas tree. Any figure substantially above 8 annas is due to manural kperiments. The ryot could probably do it for a little less, by saving something on labour charges, and from my discussion with officers of the Agricultural Department and with coconut planters, I consider that the ryot could give the full treatment advocated by the Department for about 6 annas a tree. Whether the ryots of South Kanara who have taken up the dry cultivation of coconuts are spending as much as that is a different matter. In Serial No.112 of the demonstration plots shown in the leaflet, which I inspected, and which is extremely well cared for, the expense must be about 6 annas per tree. In others it is obviously not as much as 2 annas a tree.

The Nileshwar No.III plantation is in general definitely inferior to No.II. It is planted on coarse sandy soil, which contains little organic matter and ~~have~~ no capacity for retaining water. I am inclined to think that it is impossible to raise a really successful plantation, on soil of this nature, without irrigating it at least until it reaches maturity."

The Deputy Director suggests an age limit of 25 years. not opposed in principle to an age limit but I doubt if 25 years is the proper one. I have made careful enquiries into the matter in Malabar and I find that dry plantations in Malabar become profitabl in 15-20 years. I certainly would not put it at more than 20. As far as South Kanara is concerned there is not enough evidence to enab

perhaps, to its doubtful method of planting does not prove anythin It could not even be asserted with confidence that it will become profitable in 25 years, or ever. The dry "demonstration" plots in South Kanara are too young for any conclusions to be based on them. Then again it would not be practicable to apply an age limit at present. The age of a "demonstration" plot is given, but in general we do not know the age of a plantation and if it came to a dispute with a ryot as to whether a plantation was more or less than 25 years old, I would not care to give a decision, in the absence of any record of the date of planting, on an Inspector's estimate or even on my own estimate of the age. During the currency of resettlement there will be a regular inspection of dry lands and the year in which any dry land is planted with coconut trees will be noted. It might then be possible, and, looking a long way ahead, I should think it would be desirable to exempt new gardens from reclassification until they reach a certain age. It would go a long way to meet the chief objection of the ryot:--that he spends a good deal on laying out a plantatio continues to spend for a number of years until the trees begin to bear and then, as soon as he starts getting nuts finds his assessment raised, sometimes by a substantial amount. This objection will probably become more pronounced after resettlement when there will be no waiting for a period of 30 years before the reclassification of dry lands. I venture to submit that the whole quest of reclassifying dry lands during the currency of resettlement is one which requires separate investigation.

The Deputy Director mentions the figure of 25 nuts per year. In my reference 3257/33 (Confidential) dated 9/10/33, I suggested, tentatively, a figure of 15 nuts with reference to a similar point which was raised in Malabar. The lowest garden rate in Malabar is however Rs.1-3-0 whereas the lowest rate in South Kanara will be at Resettlement Rs.2-4-0. In considering the question what the yield of a tree should be to justify its assi

counted as a garden tree, I find myself embarassed by the fact that we take the very low number of 10 coconut trees as sufficient for the reclassification of one acre of land. No ryot who start a regular plantation plants the trees as thinly as 10 to the acre but since we take that figure we ought to be able to justify it. The 10 tree garden was not really considered in working out the rates at the last settlement. I invite attention to the proposals of the Deputy Commissioner printed in Proceedings of the Government of Madras, No.757, Revenue, dated the 25th August 1902. paragraphs 75 and 77. It will be seen that for his proposal A the Deputy Commissioner took 25 trees as the standard, for determining the outturn, for proposal B, Block I, 30 trees and for Block II 20 trees The outturns are given in paragraph 88 and the money rates in paragraph 102. The lowest outturn which the Deputy Commissioner considered was 480 nuts per year for which the half net worked out at Rs.2-11-7. Rs.2/(the lowest garden rate would have been the appropriate rate, according to the Deputy Commissioner's method, for an outturn of about 350 nuts, and it is not every 10 tree garden which yields that number. The Deputy Commissioner's proposals were not approved and the question was solved by classing gardens as best, superior, good, ordinary, inferior bad and worst and assessing them at arbitrary rates ranging from Rs.8 to Rs.2. I quote the Deputy Commissioner's calculations however to show that if the rates had finally been fixed in accordance with a detailed enquiry into the money value of the produce it would have been difficult to find a place in the Scheme for a 10 tree bad or worst garden. I may add that it would be equally difficult to fit into the Scheme a 50 or 60 tree best garden, since a calculation of money values would have shown that for such "best" gardens Rs.14 or 15 would have been moderate assessments this sort of defect, that the rates are too low for the best lands and press heavily on the worst, is, perhaps common to all settlements but it does seem more than usually pronounced in the West Coast

garden classification.

The Deputy Director takes the value of a nut, to the ryot, as 6 pies. The price of coconuts varies a good deal from time t time and from place to place, but, after enquiry I am of the opinion that this is about as much as the ryot can hope to get a present, except in certain favoured localities. Taking 25 nuts per tree, and 10 trees (the minimum number) the value of the produce would be .. .. Rs 7-13-0

Deduct cultivation expenses (10× 6 as) Rs 3-12-0

Remainder Rs 4- 1-0

The minimum garden assessment Rs 2-4-0 would represent more than half the net produce. The actual resettlement commutation rate is Rs 24-12-0 (Rs 22 plus 12½%) and at a time when prices are falling it is not safe to examine the effect of resettlement rat at anything higher than the actual commutation rate. According to the principles of settlement, the resettlement rate should represent half the net produce at the actual commutation rate. The amount allowed, for cultivation expenses can be worked out as follows:

	Rs	As	Ps
Value of 250 nuts @ Rs 24-12-0 per 1000 ..	6	3	0
Deduct Rs 2-4-0 (lowest garden rate) as Government's half net and another Rs 2-4-0 as the ryots' half net. ..	4	8	0
Remainder	1	11	0

I have no doubt that Rs 1-11-0 would ordinarily cover the amount actually spent by the ryot on 10 average trees. But it would appear that by this "dry" cultivation method the ryot may spend as much as 6 annas per tree without getting anything more than an inferior yield. He could afford even at this rate to pay a garden assessment on 20 trees or more to the acre but not on 10. I may observe that if the "dry" cultivation method requires an annual expenditure of 6 annas per tree, with no profit for

25 years (as estimated by the Deputy Director) then in my opinion the ryot will drop it. I do not think it is any use pursuing the question of money values further than this. It is impossible to evolve a comprehensive formula for the classification of gardens since the whole system or garden classification is largely artificial There is not much harm in this since the rates for "best" gardens are extremely favourable and the rates for others can be scaled down. All that is necessary is that at the bottom of the scale, in dealing with what I should call "minimum" gardens the Settlement Officer must be allowed a fairly wide discretion to retain such gardens as dry, and must not be restricted to the application of hard and fast rules. I presume in view of our experience in Malabar that Government is prepared to concede this. I certainly think that we should deal leniently with the new "dry" gardens of South Kanara. They were started, from about 1920 onwards, in the belief that by the "dry" method waste lands could readily be converted into good gardens ("Money in coconuts" was the slogan posted on the "demonstration" plots); and very considerable sums of money have been invested in these new plantations, particularly in the area around Trikarpur and Chervattur, Kasaragod taluk. propose that in dealing with new gardens cultivated by the dry method we should not reclassify them unless they can be considered mature and productive. I do not wish to commit myself at present to any precise definition of the phrase "mature and productive" I do believe that in classifying gardens precise definitions are not helpful when you come down to "hard cases". As regards the gardens we are now considering, I think that in general they will obviously be immature and not productive. I have inspected a number of plots, planted from 1923 onwards, and those I saw could not be reclassified even by a strict application of the "ten bearing tree" rule. The result will be that most, probably, of the new "dry" gardens started on the advice of the

Agricultural Department will not be reclassified at Resettlement.

I venture to submit that the "dry" cultivation of coconuts in South Kanara should at present be recommended as an experiment only, for those who can afford to experiment.

W Bouchier
11/4
Special Settlement Officer.

P.S.A./21-11.

Submitted to the Board.

I too was camping at Nileshwar in October and I went into the question. I have little to add to Mr Bouchier's interesting report. For the decision of the matter in hand it is important that Mr Bouchier holds (and I agree with him) that the experimental dry coconut gardens in this district have not come to bearing to the extent that they could reasonably be classed as bearing cocoanut gardens and assessed as such now at resettlement. A tree with one or two nuts on it cannot be classed as a bearing tree, because cocoanut trees till now have been thought of as trees cultivated and irrigated in the traditional manner, which could be relied upon to produce good crops of nuts as soon as they came to bearing. Even in the Nileshwar garden there will be seen one or two trees near the cooly huts, under which the coolies have done their washing (and perhaps other things). These trees are bearing profusely. If then dry gardens are to be assessed soon as they come to bearing, ~~for bearing~~ it will be necessary to lay down that 'bearing' means 'bearing properly', or as Mr Bouchier says 'mature and productive'.

It is a great pity that the Agricultural Department combined its campaign of dry cocoanut planting with surface planting, because those that followed this advice are left with gardens whichare never likely to be good gardens. Whether the

Government in the Revenue Department can give any concession to ryots who have followed advice by another department which is now found to be bad advice, is another matter. So far as my observation goes, the advice was followed by those who can afford to bear the loss. The ordinary ryot in South Kanara is not easily persuaded to grow cocoanuts in a different way to that used by his grandfather, and he went unmoved by the advertisement boards of the Agricultural Department, which were prominent in 1927 but have all been removed now. There would therefore be little difficulty in compiling a list of dry cocoanut plantations started under the advice of the Agricultural Department.

Statement showing the yield of the Nileshwar No.II Station in 1932.

Block No.	No. of trees flowered up to 1932.	Total yield.	Average per bearing tree.
I.	142	2,355	16.58
II.	139	943	6.78
III.	115	1,450	12.60
IV.	90	834	9.26
V.	98	2,064	21.06
VI.	97	1,092	11.25

C.F. 16 24,90,350—30-10-30. (6

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

Enclosures.

Despatch No

When given to fair copying

Fair-copied by

Fair-copy compared by

When despatched

Office.

Register No. ated

From N. nfd 594/37 with cottis suit } -A to Govt / Q to file

Subject.

Settlement Resettlement (S. Kanara) - Coconut plantations on dry lands classification as garden Report ordered

To

THE

Ref 7 3578/37.2 of 20728

Submitted to the govt.

2/- The Board agrees with the S.S.O that the dry plantations in S. Kanara should be ~~reclassified as garden~~ left as dry if they are not mature and productive though possibly bearing that the result will the S.S.O considers, that ~~most~~ probably none, of the new dry gardens planted on the advice the Agricultural department will ~~not~~ be reclassified at the resettlement

3/- The S.S.O suggests that in dealing with gardens at the bottom of the scale the

Settlement officer ~~must~~ be allowed a fairly wide discretion to retain such gardens as a, and must not be restricted to the application of hard and fast rules. The Board submits that in the case of Malabar, the spread over ~~pomaples~~ pomiculture and the adjoining gardens ~~rate~~ principle ~~were~~ for laid down by Govt. for the Reclassification of dry lands as garden ~~at Resettlement~~ were followed rigidly in their application ~~with the result that~~ giving rise to severe cases of substantial hardship ~~owing~~ deemed to the ~~enhancement~~ increase of assessment ~~now~~ The rules should of course have been followed as ~~the~~ guiding principles only and ought ~~to~~ not to have been applied too strictly ~~In the case~~ As ordered in Board's Ref No X D 2625/33-2 dated 19-12-33 the S.S.O. No. W Party is ~~now~~ under the instructions of the Commr of Settlement ~~Case of S Kanara~~, following the above principles as guides only ~~and not as~~ and not as rigid rules in ~~case~~ reclassifying dry lands as gardens in S. Kanara. The S.S.O is also ignoring the ~~fact~~ fact ~~that~~ two bottom farms in accordance with the decision arrived at in

X Draft on S Kanara only to be where it ... is ... is in existence ... No 1 ... filed up after Receipt ...

...ati ure Hamble

...e Dev. member at ...rtacamun

...ni September last. Actually

...and cases are ~~there~~ thing not

...being counted in ...ara

SURVEY
8 FEB 1934
Read and Returned
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Received.....1934. Registered.....1934.

SECY
12 FEB 1934

Abstract.-

Settlement-Resettlement - (South Kanara)-Coconut plantations on dry lands - classification as garden - Orders passed.

Revenue Department.

...o. .3 361 Dated 20th February 1934.

Read the following:-

G.O. ..o. 347 Revenue dated 23rd January 1929.
From the Director of Agriculture, No.D.3.1483/33 dated 27-9-33.
From the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement, Ref. ...3513/ -2 dated 20-12-33.

Under paragraph 6 of the Settlement notification for the South Kanara district approved in G.O.No.917 Revenue, dated 9-10-1902, ten bearing coconut palms to an acre render a survey field or sub-division assessable as garden. For the purpose of enabling the Settlement Officer to prepare his scheme reports for the re-settlement of that district, the Government in January 1929 tentatively approved the proposal of the Board of Revenue that dry lands in the district which have been converted into garden should be reclassified as garden at re-settlement. The Director of Agriculture considers that the strict application of the rule will prejudicially affect coconut gardens started without irrigation or with restricted irrigation on the advice of the Agricultural department, as in most cases such gardens will not yet be yielding sufficiently to give the cultivators a profit. He has recommended that, for classification at re-settlement, the criterion to be adopted should be that where coconuts are no grown trees should be 25 years old before they are treated as "bearing

2. [illegible] ...ecured the cooperation in consulta-
...tion [illegible] ...ent Officer, No.IV Party, the
...matter [illegible] ...d of Jeremie. The
...[illegible] ...ficer must all that is necessary
...[illegible] ...dence would in any case be
...[illegible] ...the Government Officer should be
...[illegible] ...ly [illegible] ...tion is applied to the land
...[illegible] ...'. He has proposed that 'dry'
...[illegible] ...and [illegible] ...ld not be classified
...[illegible] ...'dry' if they are not a land
...[illegible] ...possibly caring, as a whole the
...[illegible] ...would result in any case,
...probably ...[illegible] ...ground would on the
...[illegible] ...; re-classified
...[illegible] ...ter and the borrower pro-
...[illegible] ...ter, the Government consider
...[illegible] ...Government Officer
...[illegible] ...such exemption.

...[illegible] ...in Council)

J.A.Thorne
...[illegible] ...to Government.

To

...[illegible] ...Development.
...[illegible] ...Development Secretary
...[illegible] ...Treasury.
...[illegible] ...Director
...[illegible] ...Land Development
...[illegible] ...Treasury, Grenada.

...[illegible] ...Secretary.
(By letter)

P Krishnan
24/9/54.
...[illegible] ...Assistant.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..		
When examined..		
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:—

Settlement - Resettlement - (South Kanara) - Coconut plantations on dry lands -- classification as garden - Orders passed - G.O. Comm - Cttee

C. F. V

READ AGAIN ..... , dated ..... 19.....

,, ,, ... ,, ... 19.....

READ *ALSO*:—

No. ..... From the ..... No. ..... , dated ..... 19.....

,, ... ,, ... ,, ... ,, ... 19.....

,, ... ,, ... ,, ... ,, ... 19.....

~~Order~~ / Resolution ~~Ms. Rout.~~ No. 636, dated 24 - 2 - 19 36.

Communicated to the Collector of South Kanara & the S.J.O. No IV party.

NOTE FILE

Settlement. Resettlement - (S. Kanara) - Coconut plantations on dry lands.

7 3573/33

Ref. 7 3573/33 dt 23.10.33

& Confdl-587/33

TO A.S. (Sett)

Please see the S.S.O's report at Pt 17-25 cf. in reply to Board's ref. 7 3573/33-1A dt 5.9.33. It is a copy of the report sent from Coll. Coll's remarks have yet to be received.

cf. For orders whether the file may be circulated to M3 as ordered by J.S.

2/ It is noted that in the S. Kanara orbd. file circulated to Comm recently, it has been suggested that in reclassifying dry lands as garden in S. Kanara, the S.S.O. may follow the lines that may be decided upon for dealing with 'hard cases' in Malab

J.S

Mal y.L matter though possibly coming.

1) ref L - regarding hard reclassification ruling regarding is big town in S Kanara. by ...

Settlement. Resettlement
(Sawantwadi) – Coconut plantations
on hillsides clarification re grant

Confdl. 574/3.

TO AS (Sett)

A copy of the Forest
Report was received direct and the
file was circulated to Commr for
favour of perusal & Pr. Secretary was
the cases Rivaldo have not been
received to enable us to Comment
may be as the file is received
from the Commr.

Plan with me
5.12.03

WAS
4.12.03

TO AS (sett)

The correspondence arose
from a Reference from Govt to Forest
on the Rivaldo's case. It was from
the Dir of Agri. where it was under
~~reference~~ ~~Govt~~ with reference to the
results obtained at the experimental station
in Nileshwar, that the clarificat
of newly planted hands on gardens on

the usual Settlement principle will result in hardship. The S.S.O. was requested to inspect the farm and submit his remarks. His remarks will be found at pp 1-9 of. He considers that

(1) the whole question of reclassifying dry lands during the currency of the Resett is one which requires separate investigation

(2) that in dealing with new gardens cultivated by the dry method we should not reclassify them unless they can be considered mature & productive.

(3) that fairly wide discretion should be allowed and should not be restricted by hard and fast rules. The Collr. is in agreement with Rr. Boundra

2) The question of the relief to be granted in land cases resulting from reclassification from dry to ga in Malabar has been separately considered in the S. Kanara file linked therewith it is suggested that such concessional treatment as may be decided upon in the case of Malabar may be extended to S. Kanara also

TO A.S. (Sett)

Draft ordered

A.S.
B.12 D.C./Sept. 3.12.33

If so.

Sund- will bring D/C here if so

[Issued as Govt Ref F. 353/33-L
dt. 20-12-33

F. 353/34 - From Govt

(Sett

Please see the G.O. at bp 2 - 2. c.f. regarding the classification of ~~cocoanut~~ coconut plantations on dry lands/. The Board's recommendation has been accepted. The G.O. may be communicated to the S.S.O. No IV party & the Collr of S. Kanara. Draft ordered.

23-12-33

23.12.33